

SCANDAL IN HIGH LIFE.

The Daughter of the Earl of Clare Expires With Lord Cecil Gordon—Interesting Divorce Case in London.

In the London Court of Divorce, March 2, the case of Cavendish vs. Cavendish and Gordon, came upon a petition by the husband for dissolution of marriage on the ground of the wife's adultery. He also claimed damages against the co-respondent. The respondent appeared, and traversed the charge; the co-respondent did not appear.

Dr. Swabey and Mr. Hodgson for the petitioner; Dr. Deane, Q. C., and Dr. Tristram for the respondent. The petitioner, Mr. Francis William Henry Cavendish, is a gentleman of good family, and on the 24th of April, 1866, he married the respondent, Lady Eleanor Sophia Diana Fitzgibbon, who was the daughter of the Earl and Countess of Clare.

They cohabited at Hyde Park street, Hyde Park Square, and other places in London, and had three children, the youngest of whom is about three years of age. In 1861 the petitioner met with a severe accident, and he consequently went abroad with his family for some time. He returned in the course of 1862, and took up his residence at Silverlands, near St. Leonard's. The co-respondent, Lord Cecil Gordon, married the half-sister of Lady Cavendish, and is the father of nine children, the eldest being about twenty-five years of age. Standing in the relationship of brother-in-law to the petitioner, the greatest intimacy existed between the two families. In June, 1864, he went, accompanied by his daughter, on a visit to Silverlands, and while there he fell ill.

He was nursed with every possible kindness and attention, and it was also stated that his circumstances were such that other matters necessary to his obligations to the petitioner. Shortly after this visit he came to reside with his family at a place called Gray's Lodge, quite close to Silverlands. The intimacy between the two families became, if possible, greater, but the distance between them was a barrier to the respondent and co-respondent, he being sixty and she not more than twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of age, precluded all idea of suspicion. On the 30th January, 1865, Lord Cecil Gordon died at his usual residence at the residence of the petitioner, and on the 22nd February, Lady Eleanor Cavendish left her house for London, on the pretense of visiting her mother, Lady Clare, who was then ill.

She was accompanied to the station by her husband, and was expected to return home the next day. On the following day, accordingly, the carriage was sent twice to the station to meet her; but the suspicions of the petitioner were not aroused until a letter was written to her by her mother's address was returned. It was then found that Lord Cecil Gordon had also left his home. Inquiries were set on foot, and he and Lady Eleanor were found living as man and wife, and passing under the name of Graham. In stating the case to the jury, the learned counsel (Mr. Hodgson) observed that the motive which must have influenced the co-respondent in the matter was as clear as day. In January, 1864, Lord Cecil died, and by his will all of his property, after the death of Lady Clare, reverted to his daughter, Lady Eleanor Cavendish. The co-respondent was a man of fortune, and the result could hardly be doubted. The respondent had been married enough, or had enough, to leave her husband's house, who had treated her with kindness and affection, and had gone to live with a man who was her brother-in-law. From the circumstances under which she was believed to have left her husband, it was clear that she was carrying on an adulterous intercourse, and the only question, therefore, which remained, was as to the damages. In assessing those they should look to all the circumstances of the case, and say what they thought was a reasonable compensation, so far as money could be a compensation, for the loss the petitioner had suffered.

In considering that matter, a very natural question arose whether the husband had been all to blame. They had, it was contended, evidence that the petitioner and respondent had lived on the best of terms. He was described as a kind and indulgent husband, and there was not a suggestion of any shortcoming on his part. But if he had been all to blame, the result of the conduct of Lord Cecil Gordon? It was well said that the gravity of an offense might be measured by the obligations which were broken, or by the consequences which followed from its commission. If they applied either lastly to the will of the co-respondent, it would not appear less lighter or heavier. They could hardly find any case in which the obligations which were violated were so numerous and so strong, or in which the consequences were so painful.

Here was a man who had advanced in the period of his life, himself a married man with nine children, visiting and partaking of the hospitality of the petitioner, and receiving kindnesses from him, and then taking advantage of the intimacy which he had with the family, including the wife of his friend and relative, to leave her home with him. Whether the motive was necessary or not did not signify, the result was the same. So far as he (Sir J. P. Wilde) could see there was not the slightest excuse or extenuation for such a course. It was not a defect on the part of the husband—there was no want of kindness on his part, and there was not one circumstance which, so far as the respondent and co-respondent were concerned, could lessen the guilt of the gross violation and double infraction of their marriage vows.

In reply to a juror, who observed that they had evidence before them as to the means of the co-respondent, Sir J. P. Wilde said that if a man did not pay in pocket he should pay in pain. The property of the co-respondent was not the measure of damages. The measure of damages was what the petitioner had suffered. The jury, after deliberating for a short time, found the adultery charged had been committed, and assessed the damages against the co-respondent at £10,000. They added that it was one of the grossest cases that ever came before them.

His Lordship granted a decree nisi, with costs against the co-respondent. A Mother and Son Claim to be Members of the Royal Family—The Lady Claims the Title of Princess and the Dukedom of Cumberland for Her Son.

Some mention has been made in the Court of Probate upon one or two recent occasions of the case of "Hives" against the Attorney-General. It may not be generally known that, although the cause has not as yet assumed a very important shape, it involves points of historical interest, and when it shall have come fully before the Court it will, we have no doubt, attract a large share of public attention. The suit is undertaken by a mother and her son, who, though they are now living in comparative obscurity, aspire to the high honor of being recognized as members of the royal family. In endeavoring to accomplish their end it will be necessary for them to inquire somewhat closely into the history of King George III. and many curious incidents may of necessity be brought out by the evidence and documents exhibited in reference to this part of the case. For Mrs. Hives, the petitioner, asserts that she has descended from the royal family by private marriage, contracted by the fourth brother of George III, who was known as Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland. The lady to whom the Prince is said to have been married, was Olive Wilton, the daughter of Dr. James Wilton, rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, in Warwickshire. His wife, the mother of this Olive Wilton, was a Polish princess. How much interesting matter it will be necessary to disclose, for the purpose of this suit, respecting the private relations existing between the Prince and Olive Wilton prior to the alleged marriage, it is impossible to say at present; but as the whole suit hinges upon this point, everything incidental to the intimacy of Prince Frederick and Dr. Wilton and his family will no doubt be thoroughly canvassed.

But whether this marriage can be proved or not, it is quite certain that it was acknowledged at the time, for the gossip of the period seem to have made it one of their stock subjects, and the daughter born of the marriage was also publicly recognized. It seems, however, that in the course of time the Prince got into a scrape with Mrs. Horton, a sister to the Colonel Luttrell, who was afterwards a member of Parliament by Court influence. He had been seduced by "Demagogue Wilkes." The Prince eventually married Mrs. Horton, and, as the lady was committed in the face of the acknowledgment of the issue of the former marriage, it became necessary that some steps should be taken to put up the scandal. The histories referring to the period show that the King about this time would not receive his brother at court, and it is conjectured, with some show of reason, that the prohibition arose from the fact that he had been seduced by the latter. The consequence upon this bigamous marriage. The Prince, accordingly, unwilling or unable to deny himself the pleasure of Mrs. Norton's society, and equally loath to be denied the court, neglected his first wife, who afterwards died in France. He also consented to a proposal that his daughter should be brought up in ignorance of her parentage until the scandal had died a natural death, and certain distinguished persons who had distinguished themselves by their services to the satisfaction of all concerned, save those who, if the story be true, had been most grievously wronged, the marriage of the Prince with Mrs. Horton was allowed to pass without further notice. It is stated that the King was not content with this arrangement, but that he continued to be acknowledged as the only and childless wife of Prince Frederick, Duke of Cumberland. It is easily conceived that an arrangement such as that which, it is said, was come to between the Prince and King was not considered without some writing, and it is asserted that several documents were signed touching the legitimacy of the daughter of the Prince and his wife, see Olive Wilton. These documents, it is further asserted, were witnessed by more than one distinguished person, and were carefully preserved at the King's request. They were ultimately committed to the care of certain eminent persons, upon whom a solemn obligation of secrecy was laid until the happening of certain events which have already been mentioned. The names of these persons, we have no doubt, be made known in the course of the proceedings before Sir J. P. Wilde.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

undertaken by a mother and her son, who, though they are now living in comparative obscurity, aspire to the high honor of being recognized as members of the royal family. In endeavoring to accomplish their end it will be necessary for them to inquire somewhat closely into the history of King George III. and many curious incidents may of necessity be brought out by the evidence and documents exhibited in reference to this part of the case. For Mrs. Hives, the petitioner, asserts that she has descended from the royal family by private marriage, contracted by the fourth brother of George III, who was known as Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland. The lady to whom the Prince is said to have been married, was Olive Wilton, the daughter of Dr. James Wilton, rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, in Warwickshire. His wife, the mother of this Olive Wilton, was a Polish princess. How much interesting matter it will be necessary to disclose, for the purpose of this suit, respecting the private relations existing between the Prince and Olive Wilton prior to the alleged marriage, it is impossible to say at present; but as the whole suit hinges upon this point, everything incidental to the intimacy of Prince Frederick and Dr. Wilton and his family will no doubt be thoroughly canvassed.

But whether this marriage can be proved or not, it is quite certain that it was acknowledged at the time, for the gossip of the period seem to have made it one of their stock subjects, and the daughter born of the marriage was also publicly recognized. It seems, however, that in the course of time the Prince got into a scrape with Mrs. Horton, a sister to the Colonel Luttrell, who was afterwards a member of Parliament by Court influence. He had been seduced by "Demagogue Wilkes." The Prince eventually married Mrs. Horton, and, as the lady was committed in the face of the acknowledgment of the issue of the former marriage, it became necessary that some steps should be taken to put up the scandal. The histories referring to the period show that the King about this time would not receive his brother at court, and it is conjectured, with some show of reason, that the prohibition arose from the fact that he had been seduced by the latter. The consequence upon this bigamous marriage. The Prince, accordingly, unwilling or unable to deny himself the pleasure of Mrs. Norton's society, and equally loath to be denied the court, neglected his first wife, who afterwards died in France. He also consented to a proposal that his daughter should be brought up in ignorance of her parentage until the scandal had died a natural death, and certain distinguished persons who had distinguished themselves by their services to the satisfaction of all concerned, save those who, if the story be true, had been most grievously wronged, the marriage of the Prince with Mrs. Horton was allowed to pass without further notice. It is stated that the King was not content with this arrangement, but that he continued to be acknowledged as the only and childless wife of Prince Frederick, Duke of Cumberland. It is easily conceived that an arrangement such as that which, it is said, was come to between the Prince and King was not considered without some writing, and it is asserted that several documents were signed touching the legitimacy of the daughter of the Prince and his wife, see Olive Wilton. These documents, it is further asserted, were witnessed by more than one distinguished person, and were carefully preserved at the King's request. They were ultimately committed to the care of certain eminent persons, upon whom a solemn obligation of secrecy was laid until the happening of certain events which have already been mentioned. The names of these persons, we have no doubt, be made known in the course of the proceedings before Sir J. P. Wilde.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

The case has already been before the public, not only in courts of justice, but also in Parliament, and the result is that the title of the petition to the crown was made in 1819, and the last in 1858. In 1861 Mrs. Hives, then sixty-four years of age, obtained a decree against the Attorney-General establishing the marriage of Prince Frederick with Olive Wilton, and that she was the daughter of the Duke's first marriage, and the chief object of the present petition is, as we have already stated, to establish Mrs. Hives' descent through this lady from Prince Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, and it is this Mrs. Horton who is the ultimate object of the present petition to the honor and dignity of the Dukedom of Cumberland, and her own right to the title of Princess of Cumberland.

NEWS JOTTINGS.

The Norfolk (Virginia) Post is for sale. Pollard's Memphis paper has been enlarged. It was an Atlantic before. General Devens has been appointed to succeed General Bennett in command at Charleston, S. C. Governor Bullock has appointed Thursday, April 5, as the day of the annual fast in Massachusetts. General J. C. Pemberton, late C. S. A., is living at Newton, on the Weldon and North Carolina Railroad.

The foundation of a new theatre was laid in Rochdale, England, recently. The company is got up in one-pound shares. Mrs. Ould, who attempted to murder her paramour some time since, at Richmond, was fined one cent and released, on Friday last. The Charleston Courier says that there is not the least cause for apprehension about the crops, either in Georgia or North Carolina. The Rock Island Paper Mill Company of Columbus, Georgia, announce their purpose of rebuilding their paper works at an early day.

The locomotive works at Manchester, N. H., now employ one hundred men and their buildings will be enlarged this spring so as to employ four hundred. C. W. Howard and Judge Shaffer, of California, have the largest dairy farm in the world. Their farm is on the sea-coast, twenty-five miles west of San Francisco, and covers 7,000 acres. A large portion of the winter wheat crop in the vicinity of St. Joseph, Missouri, has been severely injured. Some of the farmers intend to plough up their fields and sow spring wheat.

Frank Blair made a characteristic speech at a Democratic meeting at Jefferson City, Missouri, on Saturday night. He indorsed the President's veto, denounced the radicals generally, and urged the State Convention to place Blair in the White House. Oscar T. Burns, of Albany, N. Y., is reported as an absentee, and a defaulter to the amount of more than \$200,000. He was largely engaged in speculation. A large number of banks are largely involved by the transaction. It is understood that upwards of £300,000 have been privately subscribed for the Atlantic Telegraph Company, and an appeal will probably be made to the public for £250,000 to complete the manufacture of new cables, with a view to another attempt at submerging them during the present year.

A New York letter-writer says that "curious notes" have been discovered touching a forthcoming work by a young mulatto girl of that city. The manuscript has been read by several well-known literary men, and it is said to show great brilliancy of style and vigor of thought. The only objection to be made is to the probability of publishing it just at this time, but a prominent house is negotiating for the work.

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

Surveys of the plan of the FIFTH SECTION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND WARD, bounded as follows:—(North by) Center street, (West by) Third street, (East by) Broad street, (South by) Chestnut street. At the Court-room, Main Building of the State House, to consider said plan and any objections against the same, which may be made by any freeholder, and in the meanwhile the said plan may be seen at the Office of the Department of Surveys for the City of Philadelphia, No. 212 S. FIFTH STREET, and a Duplicate thereof at the Office of the Surveyor and Regulator of the Fourth Survey District, No. 221 W. SECOND STREET, A. W. BROWN, Collector of the City of Philadelphia, (Docket 5, page 41.)

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

DELAWARE MUTUAL SAFETY INSURANCE COMPANY INCORPORATED IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1855. OFFICE 8 E. CORNER THIRD AND WALNUT STS. FIRE, MARINE AND INSURANCE. ON GOODS BY RIVER, CANAL, LAKE, AND SEA. ON MERCHANDISE GENERALLY. ON SIGES, BREWING MACHINES, ETC.

ASSETS OF THE COMPANY. 100,000 United States 5 per cent. loan, 71,000,000 12,000,000 3-10 per cent. loan, 124,375,000 100,000 State of Pennsylvania Six Per Cent. Bonds, 50,000,000 50,000 City of Philadelphia Six Per Cent. Bonds, 50,000,000 20,000 Pennsylvania Railroad Bonds, 20,000,000 20,000 Erie Railroad Bonds, 20,000,000 20,000 Western Pennsylvania Railroad Bonds, 20,000,000 15,000 100 Shares Stock German Loan Company, 15,000,000 1,000 Shares Stock North Pennsylvania Railroad Company, 1,000,000 5,000 Deposit with United States Government, 5,000,000 30,000 State of Pennsylvania 10 Per Cent. Loan, 30,000,000 17,000 City Property, 17,000,000 \$1,000,000 Par. Market value, \$980,500.00 Real Estate, 30,000,000 Bills receivable, 11,000,000 Balances due at Agencies—Premiums on Marine Policies, Accrued Interest on Bonds, 40,000,000 Scrip and stock sundry insurance companies, 2,300,000 Cash in Drawer, 670,000 56,685,311 \$1,328,649.18

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke, J. F. Penland, Henry Sloan, William G. Hamilton, Edward Bradford, John H. Penrose, James H. Penrose, Henry C. Dabell, Jr., James C. Hand, William C. Hand, John D. Taylor. THOMAS S. HAND, President. JOHN C. DAVIS, Vice-President. HENRY LILIBURN, Secretary.

Directors: Samuel H. Hoke,